



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/726,266	11/30/2000	Steven L. Pratt	AUS9-2000-0486-USI	5203

35525 7590 04/08/2004

DUKE W. YEE
CARSTENS, YEE & CAHOON, L.L.P.
P.O. BOX 802334
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

LEE, PHILIP C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/726,266

Applicant(s)

PRATT ET AL.

Examiner

Philip C Lee

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 November 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-28 are presented for examination.
2. It is noted that although the present application does contain line numbers in the specification and claims, the line numbers in the claims do not correspond to the preferred format. The preferred format is to number each line of every claim, with each claim beginning with line 1. For ease of reference by both the Examiner and Applicant all future correspondence should include the recommended line numbering.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4. The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an

international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 13-16, 18, 20-23 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Win et al, U.S. Patent 6,161,139 (hereinafter Win).

6. As per claims 1, 13-14, 18 and 27, Win taught the invention as claimed for managing resources in a computer network, comprising:

defining the contents of a configuration file for each network user (col. 12, lines 45-50; col. 15, lines 30-37);

receiving a login identification from a user (col. 15, lines 45-55; col. 9, lines 36-40);

matching the user identity with the user configuration file (col. 5, lines 27-32; col. 10, lines 27-35); and

attaching network resources to a client computer based on the user identity and the contents of the user configuration file (col. 5, lines 56-62; col. 7, lines 39-41; col. 11, lines 29-44; col. 13, lines 59-60; col. 23, lines 35-37).

7. As per claims 2 and 15, Win taught the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 14 above. Win further taught wherein the contents of the configuration file are defined by a network administrator (col. 12, lines 45-50).

8. As per claims 3 and 16, Win taught the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 14 above.

Win further taught wherein the configuration file is stored on a network server (col. 12, lines 2-6; col. 16, lines 43-54; col. 23, lines 20-23).

9. As per claim 4, Win taught the invention as claimed in claim 1 above. Win further taught wherein the step of attaching resources to a client is accomplished by means of a resource attachment program (col. 12, lines 45-50).

10. As per claims 6 and 20, Win taught the invention as claimed in claims 4 and 18 above. Win further taught wherein the resource attachment program is stored on a network server (fig. 7; col. 12, lines 51-53).

11. As per claims 7 and 21, Win taught the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 18 above. Win further taught wherein the step of attaching resources to a client further comprises creating a record of all successfully attached resources (col. 13, lines 16-19; col. 23, lines 25-32).

12. As per claims 8 and 22, Win taught the invention as claimed in claims 7 and 21 above. Win further taught wherein the record is stored on the client (col. 13, lines 20-21; col. 23, lines 47-51).

13. As per claims 9 and 23, Win taught the invention as claimed in claims 7 and 21 above. Win further taught wherein the record is stored on a network server (col. 13, lines 21-23).

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 5 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Win in view of Dircks et al, U.S. Patent 6,061,795 (hereinafter Dircks).

16. As per claims 5 and 19, Win taught the invention as claimed in claims 4 and 18 above. Win did not teach storing the resource attachment program on the client computer. Dircks taught wherein the resource attachment program is stored on the client computer (col. 14, lines 37-42).

17. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Win and Dircks because Dircks's teaching of storing the resource attachment program on the client computer would increase the efficiency of Win's system by relieving the processing of attaching resources from the server computer.

18. Claims 10-11, 24-25 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Win in view of Hudson et al, U.S. Patent 6,055,637 (hereinafter Hudson).

19. As per claims 10, 24 and 28, Win taught the invention as claimed in claims 1, 18 and 27 above. Win did not teach unattaching the resources when the user log out. Hudson taught comprising:

receiving a log out command from the user and unattaching the attached resources (col. 1, lines 67-col. 2, lines 2; col. 5, lines 64-col. 6, lines 4).

20. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Win and Hudson because Hudson's teaching of unattaching the resources would increase the efficiency of Win's system by allowing the unattached resources to be allocating to another user.

21. As per claims 11 and 25, Win taught the invention as claimed in claims 7 and 21 above. Win did not teach deleting the record of attached resources when a user log out. Hudson taught comprising:

receiving a log out command from the user and deleting the record of attached resources (col. 5, lines 64-col. 6, lines 4).

22. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Win and Hudson because Hudson's teaching of deleting the record of attached resources would increase the security of Win's system by preventing another user from accessing the record of attached resources.

23. Claims 12, 17 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Win in view of Bauer et al, U.S. Patent 5,819,047 (hereinafter Bauer).

24. As per claims 12, 17 and 26, Win taught the invention as claimed in claims 1, 14 and 18 above. Win did not teach the client computer uses the UNIX operating system. Bauer taught wherein the client computer uses the UNIX operating system (col. 1, lines 31-40; col. 3, lines 31-48).

25. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Win and Bauer because Bauer's teaching of using the UNIX operating system would enhance Win's system by increasing the field of use in their systems.

CONCLUSION

26. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

27. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

28. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip C Lee whose telephone number is (703)305-7721. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM TO 5:30 PM Monday to Thursday and every other Friday.

29. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)872-9306.

30. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)350-6121.

P.L.



**JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**